

REMARKS

35 U.S.C. §102 CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Horiuchi et al. (JP 10-146273) (USPN 6,184,621 used as translation).

Claims 1-4 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is moot.

35 U.S.C. §103 CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 5 and 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horiuchi et al. (JP 10-146273) (USPN 6,184,621 used as translation).

This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-6, 8 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 14 and 17 have been amended to depend from amended claim 7.

Independent claim 7 has been amended to include claim 8, which was cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. In amending claim 7 to include claim 8, claim 7 is amended to include that the filler is mica coated with titanium dioxide. The use of a filler that is mica coated with titanium dioxide, combined with the use of barrier ribs, as recited, for example, in claim 1, provides for the formation of a dielectric layer having a relatively high reflectance and a relatively low dielectric constant. See, for example, lines 1-5 of page 22 of the specification. As a result, embodiments of the present invention provide, for example, the desirable effect of significantly enhancing reflectivity while reducing power consumption as compared to conventional plasma display panels. See for example, problems of conventional plasma display panels with respect to low luminous efficiency and high power consumption as described in lines 15-27 of page 4 of the specification. See also line 15 of page 30, through line 4 of page 31, of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that no portion of Horiuchi discloses or suggests such problems with conventional plasma display panels, or that mica coated with titanium dioxide can be used as a filler with a barrier rib structure, to address these problems. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the use of a filler as recited, for example, in claim 1, would not be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in view of Horiuchi.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 7 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and is not obvious in view of Horiuchi et al. (JP 10-146273) (USPN 6,184,621 used as translation). Since claims 9-12 and 14-20 depend from amended independent claim 7, claims 9-12 and 14-20 are submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and are not

obvious in view of Horiuchi et al. (JP 10-146273) (USPN 6,184,621 used as translation) for at least the reasons that amended independent claim 7 is submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over same.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-6, 8 and 13 have been canceled, and claims 7, 14 and 17 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 9-12 and 14-20 are pending and under consideration. Claims 21-27 are withdrawn. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 5, 2004

By: Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501